BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 IN THE MATTER OF HILLYARD LOCKERS, PCHB No. 73 Appellant, 5 FINDINGS OF FACT, vs. 6 CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER SPOKANE COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY, 1 8 Respondent. 9

10

11

12

13

14

This matter is the appeal of a \$75 civil penalty imposed by respondent for an alleged violation of Section 6.03 of Regulation I of respondent, the same being the use of an unapproved incinerator at appellant's place of business, North 5803 Market, Spokane, on October 28, 1971.

The matter came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board (Walt Woodward, hearing officer) in the Spokane County Courthouse Annex at 10:30 a.m., April 19, 1972. Appellant was represented by its owner, Tom Ebel. Respondent was represented by its director, Fred A. Shiosaki.

Transcript of the proceeding was prepared by Nora Fay Gasman, Spokane court reporter.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. An exhibit was admitted.

On the basis of testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board prepared Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Order which were submitted to the appellant and respondent on July 1, 1972. No objections or exceptions to the Proposed Findings, Conclusions and Order having been received, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

In August of 1969, appellant firm was notified in writing by respondent that its incinerator was not of an approved type and that it was ordered not to be used to burn waste material.

II.

In November of 1970, Mr. Ebel purchased appellant firm. At this time the incinerator was being used by the former owner. Mr. Ebel continued to employ the incinerator in daily burning of waste material.

III.

On October 28, 1971, an official of respondent noticed the incinerator being used for burning of waste material, checked office records to determine that a "close" order had been issued against said incinerator in August of 1969, issued a notice of violation and levied a civil penalty of \$75.

IV.

Since receiving the notice of violation and civil penalty, Mr. Ebel has hauled his waste material to a public dump and has not used the

FINDINGS OF FACT,

 24

incinerator for waste burning. 1 From these Findings, the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to 2 3 these CONCLUSIONS 4 I. 5 Appellant was in violation of Section 6.03 of Regulation I of 6 respondent in that he used for waste burning an unapproved incinerator 7 against which respondent had issued a written "close" order. 8 II. 9 The violation was not willful. Since receiving the notice of 10 violation and civil penalty, appellant has ceased use of the 11 incinerator. 2 III. 13 The civil penalty, in the view of respondent, is for a "second" 14 offense. In the view of appellant it is for a "first" offense. 15 Because of appellant's immediate cooperation with respondent upon 16 receipt of the notice of violation, the civil penalty appears to be 17 18 excessive. Based on these Findings and Conclusions, the Pollution Control 19 Hearings Board makes the following: 2021ORDER I. 22 The notice of violation was properly issued and the appeal there-23from is without merit and cannot be sustained. 24II. 25

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

26

 27°

The civil penalty of \$75 is set aside as excessive and remanded to

| 1 | the Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority for the assessment |
|----|---|
| 2 | of a more appropriate amount. |
| 3 | DONE at Olympia, Washington this $\frac{10 \text{Uz}}{10 \text{Uz}}$ day of August, 1972. |
| 4 | POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD |
| 5 | intaile all |
| 6 | MATTHEW W. HILL, Chairman |
| 7 | 1. 5 86.1 |
| 8 | JAMES T. SHEEHY, Member |
| 9 | WALT WOODWARD, Member |
| 10 | WALT WOODWARD, Member |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 10 | ; İ |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | , |
| 23 | |
| 21 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

26 | FINDINGS OF FACT, 27 | CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

4

S. L. No. Sent A